arXiv:1009.5646v4 [math.AC] 14 May 2012

THE STANLEY CONJECTURE ON INTERSECTIONS OF FOUR MONOMIAL PRIME IDEALS

DORIN POPESCU

Abstract. We show that the Stanley's Conjecture holds for an intersection of four monomial prime ideals of a polynomial algebra S over a field and for an arbitrary intersection of monomial prime ideals $(P_i)_{i\in[s]}$ of S such that each P_i is not contained in the sum of the other $(P_j)_{j\neq i}$.

Key words : Monomial Ideals, Stanley decompositions, Stanley depth.
2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 13C15, Secondary 13F20, 13F55, 13P10.

Introduction

Let $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, $n \in \mathbf{N}$, be a polynomial ring over a field K. Let $I \subset S$ be a monomial ideal of S and $u \in I$ a monomial in I. For $Z \subset \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ let $uK[Z]$ be the linear K-subspace of I generated by the elements uf, $f \in K[Z]$. A presentation of I as a finite direct sum of such spaces $\mathcal{D}$: $I = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r} u_i K[Z_i]$ is called a Stanley decomposition of I. Set $\operatorname{sdepth}(\mathcal{D}) := \min\{|Z_i| : i = 1, \ldots, r\}$ and

$$\operatorname{sdepth}\ I := \max\{\operatorname{sdepth}\ (\mathcal{D}) :\ \mathcal{D} \text{ is a Stanley decomposition of } I\}.$$

Stanley's Conjecture [12] says that sdepth $I \geq$ depth I. This would be a nice connection between a combinatorial invariant and a homological one. The Stanley's Conjecture holds for arbitrary squarefree monomial ideals if $n \leq 5$ by [9] (see especially the arXiv version), and for intersections of three monomial prime ideals by [8]. In the non squarefree monomial ideals a useful inequality is $\operatorname{sdepth} I \leq \operatorname{sdepth} \sqrt{I}$ (see [5, Theorem 2.1]). In this paper we study only the case of squarefree monomial ideals.

We will extend the so called "special Stanley decompositions" of [8] (see Theorem 1.6). This tool is very important because it gives lower bounds of $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I$ in terms of sdepth of some ideals in less variables for which we may apply mathematical induction. More precisely, we use it to find "good" lower bounds of $\operatorname{sdepth}(I)$.

Let $I = \cap_{i=1}^{s} P_i$ be a reduced intersection of monomial prime ideals of S such that $P_i \not\subset \sum_{1=j\neq i}^{s} P_j$ for all $i \in [s]$. Then

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \operatorname{depth}_S I = s + \dim S/\sum_{i=1}^{s} P_i,$$

The support from the CNCSIS grant PN II-542/2009 of Romanian Ministry of Education, Research and Inovation is gratefully acknowledged.

as shows our Theorems 2.3 and 2.4. On the other hand, we show that if I is an intersection of four monomial prime ideals then again Stanley's Conjecture holds (see Theorem 4.2).

We introduce the so called the big size $t(I)$ of I (usually bigger than the size of I given in [7]) and use it to find depth formulas. If $t(I)=1$ then $\operatorname{depth} I=2$ and the Stanley's Conjecture holds (see Corollary 1.7). If $t(I)=2$ then we describe the possible values of $\operatorname{depth} I$ (see Lemmas 3.2, 3.4) although we cannot show always that the Stanley's Conjecture holds. The obstruction is hinted by Example 4.3 and Remark 4.4.

1. BIG SIZE ONE

Let $I=\cap_{i=1}^{s} P_i$, $s\geq 2$ be an irredundant intersection of monomial prime ideals of S. We assume that $\sum_{i=1}^{s} P_i = m = (x_1,\ldots,x_n)$.

Definition 1.1. Let e be the minimal number such that there exists e prime ideals among (P_i) whose sum is m. After [7] the *size* of I is $e-1$. We call the *big size* of I the minimal number $t=t(I)<s$ such that the sum of all possible $(t+1)$ prime ideals of $\{P_1,\ldots,P_s\}$ is m. We set $t(m)=0$. Clearly the big size of I is bigger or equal than the size of I. If $a=\sum_{i=1}^{s} P_i \neq m$ then let v be the minimal number $t<s$ such that the sum of all possible $(t+1)$ prime ideals of $\{P_1,\ldots,P_s\}$ is a. We call $v+\dim S/a$ the *big size* of I.

We need in our proofs the following elementary lemma.

Lemma 1.2. *Let J, E, F be some monomial ideals of S. Then there exists a canonical exact sequence*

$$0\to S/(J\cap E\cap F)\to S/(J\cap E)\oplus S/(J\cap F)\to S/(J\cap(E+F))\to 0.$$

Proof. Since the ideals are monomial we have $J\cap(E+F)=(J\cap E)+(J\cap F)$. The above exact sequence follows now from the well known exact sequence

$$0\to S/(E'\cap F')\to S/E'\oplus S/F'\to S/(E'+F')\to 0.$$

□

Lemma 1.3. *Suppose that there exists $1\leq c<s$ such that $P_i+P_j=m$ for each $c<j\leq s$ and $1\leq i\leq c$. Then $\operatorname{depth}_S I=2$. In particular, if the big size of I is 1 then $\operatorname{depth}_S I=2$.*

Proof. Using the following exact sequence (apply the above lemma for the case $J=S$, $E=\cap_{i=1}^{c} P_i$, $F=\cap_{j>c}^{s} P_j$)

$$0\to S/I\to S/\cap_{i=1}^{c} P_i\oplus S/\cap_{j>c}^{s} P_j\to S/\cap_{i=1}^{c}\cap_{j>c}^{s}(P_i+P_j)=S/m\to 0$$

we get $\operatorname{depth} S/I=1$ by Depth Lemma [13, 1.3.9], because $(\cap_{i=1}^{c} P_i)+(\cap_{j>c}^{s} P_j)=\cap_{i=1}^{c}\cap_{j>c}^{s}(P_i+P_j)=m$ by distributivity, the ideals being monomials. □

Remark 1.4. By [7, Proposition 2] $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I$ is always greater or equal than the size of I. So if the size of I is 1, then necessarily $\operatorname{depth}_S I\geq 2$. The equality follows when the big size of I is 1. It is well known that $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I$ is less than or equal to $\dim S/P$, where P is one of the assocated primes of I (see [2, Proposition 1.2.13]).

Example 1.5. Let $n = 5$, $s = 4$, $P_1 = (x_1, x_5)$, $P_2 = (x_2, x_5)$, $P_3 = (x_3, x_5)$, $P_4 = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$. Since $P_1 + P_2 + P_3 \neq m$ the big size of $I = \cap_{i=1}^4 P_i$ is 3. The above lemma gives $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 1$ because $P_i + P_4 = m$ for all $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Note that here the size of I is 1. In fact the above lemma gives examples when $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 1$ and $t(I) \geq c$ for all positive integer c.

Next we extend [8, Proposition 2.3]. Let $r < n$ be a positive integer and $S' = K[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n]$, $S'' = K[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$. We suppose that one prime ideal P_i is generated by some of the first r variables. If $P_i = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ we say that P_i is a *main prime*. For a subset $\tau \subset [s]$ we set

$$S_\tau = K[\{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq r, x_i \notin \Sigma_{j\in\tau} P_j\}]$$

and let $\mathcal{F}$ be the set of all nonempty subsets $\tau \subset [s]$ such that

$$L_\tau = (\cap_{i\in\tau} P_i) \cap S' \neq (0), \quad J_\tau = (\cap_{i\in[s]\setminus\tau} P_i) \cap S_\tau \neq (0).$$

For a $\tau \in \mathcal{F}$ consider the ideals $I_0 = (I \cap K[x_1, \ldots, x_r])S$, and

$$I_\tau = J_\tau S_\tau[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n] \cap L_\tau S_\tau[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n] \subset S_\tau[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n].$$

Write $A_\tau = \operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau[x_{r+1},\ldots,x_n]} I_\tau$ which is at least $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau} J_\tau + \operatorname{sdepth}_{S'} L_\tau$ by [10, Theorem 4.1], [8, Lemma 1.2]. We also take $A_0 = \operatorname{sdepth}_S I_0$ if $I_0 \neq (0)$, otherwise take $A_0 = n$.

Theorem 1.6. *In the above setting* $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \min(\{A_0\} \cup \{A_\tau\}_{\tau\in\mathcal{F}})$.

Proof. (after [8]) First we show that

$$I = I_0 \oplus (\oplus_{\tau\in\mathcal{F}} I_\tau),$$

where the direct sum is of linear K-spaces. Let $a \in I \setminus I_0$ be a monomial. We have $a = uv$, where $u \in S''$ and $v \in S'$. Set $\rho = \{i \in [s] : u \notin P_i\}$. Clearly, $\rho \neq \emptyset$ because $a \notin I_0$. As $a \in I \subset P_i$, we get $v \in P_i$ for all $i \in \rho$, and $v \in L_\rho$. On the other hand, by definition of ρ we have $u \in J_\rho$. Hence $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a \in I_\rho$. The sum is direct because for any $a \in I \setminus I_0$ there exists just one $\rho = \{i \in [s] : u \notin P_i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $a \in I_\rho$. Note that the monomials of $I \setminus I_0$ are disjoint union of monomials of I_τ, $\tau \in \mathcal{F}$.

Now choose "good" Stanley decompositions $\mathcal{D}_0$, $\mathcal{D}_\tau$ for I_0, respectively I_τ such that $\operatorname{sdepth}_S \mathcal{D}_0 = \operatorname{sdepth}_S I_0$, $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau[x_{r+1},\ldots,x_n]} \mathcal{D}_\tau = \operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau[x_{r+1},\ldots,x_n]} I_\tau$. They will induce a Stanley decomposition $\mathcal{D}$ of I such that

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \operatorname{sdepth}_S \mathcal{D} = \min(\{\operatorname{sdepth}_S I_0\} \cup \{\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau[x_{r+1},\ldots,x_n]} I_\tau\}_{\tau\in\mathcal{F}}). \qquad \square$$

Corollary 1.7. *If the big size of I is* 1 *then* $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq 2$, *that is Stanley's Conjecture holds for I.*

Proof. It is easy to see that the corollary holds for $n \leq 2$. If $n \geq 3$ then $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq 2 = \operatorname{depth} I$ by [3, Theorem 3.4], which is enough as shows our Lemma 1.3. For the sake of the completeness we give below another proof applying the above proposition.

Use induction on $s \geq 1$, the case $s = 1$ being easy. We may assume that $P_1 = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ for some $r < n$. By Theorem 1.6 we have

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \min(\{A_0\} \cup \{A_{\tau_i}\}_{\tau_i\in\mathcal{F}}),$$

where $\tau_i = \{i\}$ for some $1 < i \leq s$. Indeed, we have $\mathcal{F} \subset \{\tau_i\}_{1<i\leq s}$ because $P_j + P_i = m$ for all $j \neq i$. The inclusion is in fact an equality. Indeed, if

$$P_j \cap K[\{x_e : 1 \leq e \leq r, x_e \notin P_i\}] = (0)$$

for some $1 < j \neq i$ then $P_j \cap S'' \subset P_i$ and so $P_1 \subset P_j$ since $P_j + P_i = m$ (contradiction). If $I_0 \neq (0)$ then

$$A_0 = \operatorname{sdepth}_{S''}(I \cap S'') + n - r \geq 1 + \dim S/P_1 \geq 1 + \operatorname{depth} S/I = \operatorname{depth} I.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$A_{\tau_i} \geq \operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_i}}(\cap_{j\neq i} P_j \cap S_{\tau_i}) + \operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_i \cap S') \geq$$

$$\operatorname{depth}_{S_{\tau_i}}(\cap_{j\neq i} P_j \cap S_{\tau_i}) + \operatorname{depth}_{S'}((x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n)S') \geq 2$$

by induction hypothesis and because $P_j + P_i = m$ for all $j \neq i$. As $\operatorname{depth} I = 2$ by Lemma 1.3 we are done. $\square$

2. Some results of general big size

Let $I = \cap_{i=1}^s P_i$, $s \geq 2$ be an irredundand intersection of monomial prime ideals of S.

Lemma 2.1. *If* $P_1 \not\subset \sum_{i=2}^s P_i$ *then*

$$\operatorname{depth} I = \min(\operatorname{depth}(\cap_{i=2}^s P_i), 1 + \operatorname{depth}(\cap_{i=2}^s (P_i + P_1))).$$

Proof. By Lemma 1.2 we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to S/I \to S/(\cap_{i=2}^s P_i) \oplus S/P_1 \to S/(\cap_{i=2}^s (P_i + P_1)) \to 0$$

where $\operatorname{depth} S/I \leq \operatorname{depth} S/P_1$ by 1.4. Choosing a variable $x_i \in P_1 \setminus \Sigma_{i=2}^s P_i$ we see that $I : x_i = \cap_{i=2}^s P_i$. So

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I \leq \operatorname{depth} S/(I : x_i) = \operatorname{depth} S/(\cap_{i=2}^s P_i)$$

by [11, Corollary 1.3]. It follows that

$$\operatorname{depth} S/I = \min(\operatorname{depth} S/(\cap_{i=2}^s P_i), 1 + \operatorname{depth} S/(\cap_{i=2}^s (P_i + P_1)))$$

from Depth Lemma (see [13, Lemma 1.3.9]), because
$\operatorname{depth}_S S/P_1 \geq 1 + \operatorname{depth}_S S/(\cap_{i=2}^s (P_i + P_1))$. $\square$

The next theorem uses an easy lemma of Ishaq [6, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 2.2. *(Ishaq) Let* $J \subset S[y]$ *be a monomial ideal,* y *being a new variable. Then* $\operatorname{sdepth}_S(J \cap S) \geq \operatorname{sdepth}_{S[y]} J - 1$.

The following theorem extends [8, Theorem 1.4].

Theorem 2.3. *Let* $I = \cap_{i=1}^s P_i$ *be a reduced intersection of monomial prime ideals of* S. *Assume that* $P_i \not\subset \sum_{1=j\neq i}^s P_j$ *for all* $i \in [s]$. *Then*

$$\operatorname{depth}_S I = s + \dim S/\sum_{i=1}^s P_i.$$

Proof. By [4, Lemma 3.6] it is enough to consider the case when $\sum_{j=1}^s P_j = m$. Apply induction on s. If $s=1$ the result is trivial because $\operatorname{depth}_S m = 1$. Suppose that $s > 1$. We may assume that $P_1 = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ for some $r < n$ and set $S'' = K[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$, $S' = K[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n]$. By Lemma 2.1 we get

$$\operatorname{depth}_S I = \min(\operatorname{depth}_S(\cap_{i>1}^s P_i), 1 + \operatorname{depth}_S(\cap_{i>1}^s (P_i + P_1))).$$

Note that $P_i \not\subset \Sigma_{1<j\neq i}^s P_j$ for all $1 < i \leq s$ because, otherwise, we contradict the hypothesis. Then the induction hypothesis gives

$$\operatorname{depth}_S(\cap_{j>1}^s P_j) = s - 1 + \dim S/(\Sigma_{i>1}^s P_i) \geq s.$$

As $\cap_{i>1}^s (P_i + P_1)$ satisfies also our assumption, the induction hypothesis gives $\operatorname{depth}_S(\cap_{i>1}^s (P_i + P_1)) = s - 1$. Hence $\operatorname{depth}_S I = s$. □

Theorem 2.4. *Let $I = \cap_{i=1}^s P_i$ be a reduced intersection of monomial prime ideals of S. Assume that $P_i \not\subset \sum_{1=j\neq i}^s P_j$ for all $i \in [s]$. Then*

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \operatorname{depth}_S I,$$

that is Stanley's Conjecture holds for I.

Proof. As in the above theorem we may consider only the case $\sum_{j=1}^s P_j = m$. Apply induction on s. We apply Theorem 1.6 for $\mathcal{F}$ containing as usual some $\tau \subset [s]$. Note that $P_1 \cap S' = (0)$ since P_1 is generated in the first r variables. Thus $\tau \in \mathcal{F}$ cannot contain 1 by the construction of $\mathcal{F}$. We get $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \min(\{A_0\} \cup \{A_\tau\}_{\tau\in\mathcal{F}})$ for $A_0 = \operatorname{sdepth}(I \cap S'')S$ if $I \cap S'' \neq 0$ or $A_0 = n$ otherwise, and

$$A_\tau \geq \operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau}((\cap_{i\notin\tau} P_i) \cap S_\tau) + \operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(\cap_{i\in\tau} P_i \cap S'),$$

where $S_\tau = K[\{x_i : 1 \leq i \leq r, x_i \notin \Sigma_{j\in\tau} P_j\}]$. Note that $\cap_{j\in\tau} P_j \cap S'$ satisfies our assumption because if $P_k \cap S' \subset \Sigma_{j\in\tau, j\neq k}(P_k \cap S')$ and we get $P_k \subset \Sigma_{1=j\neq k}^s P_j$ which is false. Thus by induction hypothesis we have

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(\cap_{i\in\tau} P_i \cap S') \geq \operatorname{depth}_{S'}(\cap_{i\in\tau} P_i \cap S') =$$

$$|\tau| + \dim S'/(\cap_{i\in\tau} P_i \cap S') = |\tau| + \dim S/(P_1 + \Sigma_{i\in\tau} P_i),$$

using Theorem 2.3. Let $\tilde{S}_\tau = S_\tau[\{x_j : j > r, x_j \notin \Sigma_{i\in\tau} P_i)\}]$. Note that $(\cap_{i\notin\tau} P_i) \cap \tilde{S}_\tau$ satisfies our hypothesis even though $(\cap_{i\notin\tau} P_i) \cap S_\tau$ may not. Indeed, if $P_i \cap \tilde{S}_\tau \subset \Sigma_{j\notin\tau, j\neq i} P_j$ for some $i \notin \tau$ then $P_i \subset \Sigma_{1=j\neq i}^s P_j$ which is false. By Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau}((\cap_{i\notin\tau} P_i) \cap S_\tau) \geq \operatorname{sdepth}_{\tilde{S}_\tau}((\cap_{i\notin\tau} P_i) \cap \tilde{S}_\tau) - |\{i > r : x_i \notin \Sigma_{j\in\tau} P_j\}| \geq$$

$$s - |\tau| - \dim S/(P_1 + \Sigma_{i\in\tau} P_i),$$

using the induction hypothesis. Thus $A_\tau \geq s = \operatorname{depth}_S I$ by the above theorem. Finally note that if $I \cap S'' \neq (0)$ then

$$A_0 = \operatorname{sdepth}_{S''}(I \cap S'') + n - r \geq 1 + \dim S/P_1 \geq 1 + \operatorname{depth}_S S/I = \operatorname{depth}_S I$$

using [4, Lemma 3.6]. □

3. Depth on big size two

Let $I = \cap_{i=1}^s P_i$, $s \geq 3$ be a reduced intersection of monomial prime ideals of S. Assume that $\sum_{i=1}^s P_i = m$ and the big size of I is two. We may suppose that $P_1 + P_2 = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ for some $r < n$. We set

$$q = \min(\dim S/(P_i + P_j) : j \neq i, P_i + P_j \neq m).$$

Thus $q \leq n - r$. Set $S'' = K[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$, $S' = K[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n]$.

Lemma 3.1. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I \leq 1 + q$.

Proof. Note that for $i > 2$ we have $P_i \not\subset P_1 + P_2$. This is because, otherwise, $P_1 + P_2 = P_1 + P_2 + P_i = m$ by the condition $t(I) = 2$, which gives a contradiction. Then we may find a monomial $u \in \cap_{i>2}^s P_i \setminus (P_1 + P_2)$ and we have $(I : u) = P_1 \cap P_2$. Thus

$$\operatorname{depth}_S S/I \leq \operatorname{depth}_S S/(I : u) = \operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1 \cap P_2) = 1 + \dim S/(P_1 + P_2)$$

by [11, Corollary 1.3], the last equality being a consequence of Depth Lemma applied to the exact sequence

$$0 \to S/(P_1 \cap P_2) \to S/P_1 \oplus S/P_2 \to S/(P_1 + P_2) \to 0.$$

In this way we see that

$$\operatorname{depth}_S S/I \leq 1 + \min(\dim S/(P_i + P_j) : j \neq i, P_i + P_j \neq m).$$

□

Lemma 3.2. *If $P_k + P_e = m$ for all distinct $k, e > 2$, then the following statements hold:*

1. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I \in \{1, 2, 1 + q\}$,
2. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 1$ *if and only if there exists $j > 2$ such that $P_1 + P_j = m = P_2 + P_j$,*
3. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I > 2$ *if and only if $q > 1$ and each $j > 2$ satisfies either*
$$P_1 + P_j \neq m = P_2 + P_j, \text{ or}$$
$$P_2 + P_j \neq m = P_1 + P_j,$$
4. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 2$ *if and only if both the following conditions hold:*
    (a) *each $j > 2$ satisfies either $P_1 + P_j \neq m$ or $P_2 + P_j \neq m$,*
    (b) *$q = 1$ or there exists an index $k > 2$ such that*
$$P_1 + P_k \neq m \neq P_2 + P_k.$$

Proof. Apply induction on $s + n$, $s \geq 3$. If $s = 3$ then we may apply [8, Proposition 2.1, Theorem 2.6]. Suppose that $s > 3$. By Lemma 1.2 applied for $J = P_1 \cap P_2$, $E = P_3$, $F = P_4 + \ldots + P_s$ we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \to S/I \to S/(P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_3) \oplus S/(P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_4 \cap \ldots \cap P_s) \to S/(P_1 \cap P_2) \to 0$$

because $P_3+P_k=m$ for all $k>3$. Using [11, Corollary 1.3] as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, any module from the above exact sequence has depth $\leq \operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2)$. Thus

$$\operatorname{depth}_S S/I=\min(\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2\cap P_3),\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2\cap P_4\cap\ldots\cap P_s))$$

by Depth Lemma [13, Lemma 1.3.9]. Using the induction hypothesis, we get

$$\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2\cap P_3),\quad \operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2\cap P_4\cap\ldots\cap P_s)\in\{1,2,1+q\}$$

because any three prime ideals of (P_i) have the sum m. Hence (1) holds. Note that $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I=1$ if and only if either $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2\cap P_3)=1$, or $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2\cap P_4\cap\ldots\cap P_s)=1$ and (2) holds because of the induction hypothesis (see also Lemma 1.3). Similarly, (3), (4) holds by induction hypothesis relying in fact on the case $s=3$ stated in [8]. □

Lemma 3.3. *If $P_k+P_e=m$ for all distinct $k,e>2$, then* $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I\geq \operatorname{depth}_S I$.

Proof. We apply Theorem 1.6 to $\mathcal{F}$ containing some $\tau_i=\{i\}$, $2<i\leq s$ (note that $P_i+P_j=m$ for all $2<i<j\leq s$ and so $\mathcal{F}$ does not contain $\tau=\{i,j\}$). We get $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I\geq\min(\{A_0\}\cup\{A_{\tau_i}\}_{\tau_i\in\mathcal{F}})$ for $A_0=\operatorname{sdepth}_S(I\cap S'')S$ if $I\cap S''\neq 0$ or $A_0=n$ otherwise, and

$$A_{\tau_i}\geq \operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_i}}((\cap_{j=1,j\neq i}^{s}P_j)\cap S_{\tau_i})+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_i\cap S'),$$

where $S_{\tau_i}=K[\{x_j:x_j\in S'',x_j\notin P_i\}]$. Note that the big size of $J_i=(\cap_{j=1,j\neq i}^{s}P_j)\cap S_{\tau_i}$ is 1 or zero, because if $(P_k+P_e)\cap S_{\tau_i}$ is not the maximal ideal of S_{τ_i} for some two different k,e which are not i, then $P_k+P_e+P_i\neq m$ contradicting $t(I)=2$. By Corollary 1.7 we get

$$\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_i}} J_i\geq \operatorname{depth}_{S_{\tau_i}} J_i=1+\operatorname{depth}_{S_{\tau_i}} S_{\tau_i}/J_i=1+\operatorname{depth}_S S/(J_iS+P_i).$$

Then $A_{\tau_i}\geq 2+\operatorname{depth}_S S/(J_iS+P_i)$. By our hypothesis

$$J_iS+P_i=((P_1\cap S_{\tau_i})S\cap(P_2\cap S_{\tau_i})S)+P_i.$$

But $(P_k\cap S_{\tau_i})S+P_i=P_k+P_i$ for $k=1,2$ and so $J_iS+P_i=(P_1+P_i)\cap(P_2+P_i)$. If $P_1+P_i=m\neq P_2+P_i$ then $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(J_iS+P_i)=\dim S/(P_2+P_i)\geq q$. Hence $A_{\tau_i}\geq \operatorname{depth}_S I$ using (1) of the above lemma. If $P_1+P_i\neq m\neq P_2+P_i$ then we get $A_{\tau_i}\geq 3=\operatorname{depth}_S I$ using (4) of the above lemma.

Suppose that $I\cap S''\neq 0$. When $t(I\cap S'')=1$ we have $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S''}(I\cap S'')\geq 2$ by Corollary 1.7 and so $A_0\geq 2+n-r\geq 2+q\geq \operatorname{depth}_S I$. When $t(I\cap S'')=2$, since less variables are involved, we can use the induction hypothesis and we have

$$A_0\geq \operatorname{depth}_S(I\cap S'')S=n-r+\operatorname{depth}_{S''}(I\cap S'')\geq q+2\geq \operatorname{depth}_S I.$$

Note that in this case $I\cap S''$ cannot be the homogeneous maximal ideal in S''. □

Next we will consider another case when $t(I)=2$, but with the following property:
$(*)$ whenever there exist $i\neq j$ in $[s]$ such that $P_i+P_j\neq m$ there exist also $k\neq e$ in $[s]\setminus\{i,j\}$ such that $P_k+P_e\neq m$.
This is exactly the complementary case to the one solved by the above lemma. As before we may suppose that $P_1+P_2\neq m$. Now by $(*)$ we may suppose $P_s+P_{s-1}\neq m$.

Lemma 3.4. *If* $t(I) = 2$ *and* I *satisfies* $(*)$ *then*

1. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I \in \{1, 2, 1+q\}$.
2. $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 1$ *if and only if after a renumbering of* (P_i) *there exists* $1 \le c < s$ *such that* $P_i + P_j = m$ *for each* $c < j \le s$ *and* $1 \le i \le c$.

Proof. We use induction on $s \ge 3$, with the case $s = 3$ having been covered in [8, Proposition 2.1, Theorem 2.6]. Now we assume $s > 3$ and set $J = P_1 \cap \ldots \cap P_{s-2}$. Since $t(I) = 2$, $P_i + P_{s-1} + P_s = m$ for all $i < s-1$. Note that there exist no $i < s-1$ such that $P_i \subset P_{s-1} + P_s$ because otherwise $P_{s-1} + P_s = P_i + P_{s-1} + P_s = m$, which is false. Thus, in the exact sequence (apply Lemma 1.2)

$$0 \to S/I \to S/(J \cap P_{s-1}) \oplus S/(J \cap P_s) \to S/(J \cap (P_{s-1} + P_s)) \to 0$$

we have $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(J \cap (P_{s-1} + P_s)) = 1$ by Lemma 1.3. If

$$(+) \quad \operatorname{depth}_S(S/(J \cap P_{s-1}) \oplus S/(J \cap P_s)) > 1$$

then $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 2$. Otherwise, we may suppose that $\operatorname{depth}_S(S/(J \cap P_{s-1})) = 1$, where we apply part (2) of Lemma 3.2. Thus, after a renumbering of (P_i), there exists $1 \le k < s-1$ such that $P_i + P_j = m$ for each $k < j \le s-1$ and $1 \le i \le k$. In the following exact sequence (again apply Lemma 1.2 for $J = P_s$, $E = P_1 \cap \ldots \cap P_k$, $F = P_{k+1} \cap \ldots \cap P_{s-1}$)

$$0 \to S/I \to S/(P_1 \cap \ldots \cap P_k \cap P_s) \oplus S/(P_{k+1} \cap \ldots \cap P_s) \to S/P_s \to 0$$

all the modules have depth $\le \operatorname{depth}_S S/P_s$ by 1.4. It follows

$$\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = \min(\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1 \cap \ldots \cap P_k \cap P_s), \operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_{k+1} \cap \ldots \cap P_s))$$

and applying Lemma 3.2 we get (1).

In (2) the sufficiency follows from Lemma 1.3. If $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 1$ we will get, say, $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1 \cap \ldots \cap P_k \cap P_s) = 1$. Now use Lemma 3.2 and our induction hypothesis. After a renumbering of $(P_i)_{i<k}$ there exists $1 \le c \le k$ such that $P_i + P_j = m$ for each $1 \le i \le c$ and $c < j \le k$ or $j = s$. Thus, using our assumptions on k we get $P_i + P_j = m$ for each $c < j \le s$ and $1 \le i \le c$. $\square$

4. INTERSECTIONS OF FOUR PRIME IDEALS

Let $I = \cap_{i=1}^4 P_i$ be an irredundant intersection of monomial prime ideals of S. Assume that $\sum_{i=1}^4 P_i = m$ and the big size of I is two. Thus we may further assume $P_1 + P_2 \ne m$ and $P_1 = (x_1, \ldots, x_r)$, $r < n$. Set

$$q = \min(\dim S/(P_i + P_j) : j \ne i, P_i + P_j \ne m),$$

$S'' = K[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$, $S' = K[x_{r+1}, \ldots, x_n]$.

Proposition 4.1. *In the above setting* $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \ge \operatorname{depth}_S I$.

Proof. Using Lemma 3.3 we may suppose that I satisfies $(*)$ and $P_3 + P_4 \ne m$. If $\operatorname{depth}_S(S/(P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_3) \oplus S/(P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_4)) > 1$, the proof of Lemma 3.4 (see (+)) shows that $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I = 2$. Otherwise, we may assume that $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_3) = 1$. It follows from [8, Proposition 2.1] $P_1 + P_3 = P_2 + P_3 = m$, since $P_1 + P_2 \ne m$.

Then $(*)$ implies that $P_1+P_4=P_2+P_4=m$ and we have $\operatorname{depth}_S S/I=1$ by Lemma 1.3. Thus $\operatorname{depth}_S I\le 3$ if I satisfies $(*)$ even $\operatorname{depth}_S I=2$ if $P_1+P_3=P_1+P_4=P_2+P_3=P_2+P_4=m$.

Apply Theorem 1.6 for the main prime P_1 and $\mathcal{F}$ containing only possible $\tau_i=\{i\}$, $i=2,3,4$, $\tau_{ij}=\{i,j\}$ for some $1<i<j\le 4$. We get $\operatorname{sdepth} I\ge\min(\{A_0\}\cup\{A_\tau\}_{\tau\in\mathcal{F}})$. As usual, $A_0=\operatorname{sdepth}(I\cap S'')S$ if $I\cap S''\neq 0$ or $A_0=n$ otherwise. We have

$$A_{\tau_i}\ge\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_i}}((\cap_{j=2,j\neq i}^4 P_j)\cap S_{\tau_i})+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_i\cap S'),$$

for $i=2,3,4$ and

$$A_{\tau_{ij}}\ge\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_{ij}}}(P_k\cap S_{\tau_{ij}})+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_i\cap P_j\cap S'),$$

where $1<i<j\le 4$, $k=[4]\setminus\{1,i,j\}$. Here we set
$S_{\tau_{ij}}=K[x_j : x_j\in S'', x_j\notin P_i+P_j]$ and $S_{\tau_i}=K[x_j : x_j\in S'', x_j\notin P_i]$. As in Lemma 3.2 we have $A_0\ge\operatorname{depth} I$. It is enough to show that $A_{\tau_i}, A_{\tau_{ij}}\ge 3$ except in the case $P_1+P_3=P_1+P_4=P_2+P_3=P_2+P_4=m$ when it is enough to show that $A_{\tau_{34}}\ge 2$. Note that $A_{\tau_2}\ge 3$ because $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_2\cap S')\ge 1+\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_2\cap S')}{2}\rceil$.

Part $A_{\tau_i}\ge 3$, $i>2$
We study for example A_{τ_4}. Using [10, Lemma 4.3] we have

$$A_{\tau_4}\ge\sum_{j=2}^{3}\lceil\frac{\dim S''/((P_j+P_4)\cap S'')}{2}\rceil+1\ge 3,$$

if $(P_2+P_4)\cap S''$ and $(P_3+P_4)\cap S''$ do not contain each other, where $\lceil a\rceil$, $a\in\mathbf{Q}$ denotes the smallest integer not less than a. Otherwise, if $P_2\cap S''\subset P_3+P_4$ then $P_2\cap S'\not\subset P_4$ since $P_2+P_3+P_4=m$ and $P_3+P_4\neq m$. Thus $P_4\cap S'$ is not the maximal ideal of S' and so $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_4\cap S')\ge 1+\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_4\cap S')}{2}\rceil$ by [1]. Then

$$A_{\tau_4}\ge\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_4}}(P_2\cap S_{\tau_4})+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_4\cap S')\ge 2+\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_4\cap S')}{2}\rceil.$$

If $P_3\cap S''\subset P_2+P_4$ and $P_3\cap S'\not\subset P_4$ we proceed as above. If $P_3\cap S'\subset P_4$ then we get $P_2+P_4=m$ because $P_2+P_3+P_4=m$. By $(*)$ we get also $P_1+P_3=m$. It follows $P_3\cap S_{\tau_4}$ is not maximal in S_{τ_4} because $P_3+P_4\neq m$ and so

$$A_{\tau_4}\ge\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_4}}(P_3\cap S_{\tau_4})+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_4\cap S')\ge 2+\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_3\cap S_{\tau_4})}{2}\rceil.$$

Part $A_{\tau_{ij}}\ge 3$
Next, by [10, Lemma 4.3]

$$A_{\tau_{34}}\ge\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_{\tau_{34}}}(P_2\cap S_{\tau_{34}})+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_3\cap P_4\cap S')\ge$$

$$\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_2\cap S_{\tau_{34}})}{2}\rceil+\lceil\frac{\dim S'/(P_3\cap S')}{2}\rceil+\lceil\frac{\dim S'/(P_4\cap S')}{2}\rceil\ge 3$$

if $P_3\cap S'$ and $P_4\cap S'$ do not contain each other (note that $P_2+P_3+P_4=m$). Otherwise, if for example $P_3\cap S'\subset P_4$ we get $P_1+P_4=m$ because $P_1+P_3+P_4=m$, and so $P_2+P_3=m$ by $(*)$. If $P_1+P_3\neq m$ then $P_3\cap S'$ is not the maximal ideal of S'. It follows that $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_3\cap S')\geq 1+\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_3\cap S')}{2}\rceil$. Thus, $A_{34}\geq 3$. On the other hand, if $P_1+P_3=m$, then $P_2+P_4=m$ by $(*)$ and so $A_{34}\geq 2=\operatorname{depth}_S I$ as we know already. Similarly, if $\tau_{23}\in\mathcal{F}$ we get $A_{\tau_{23}}\geq 3$ if $P_2\cap S'\not\subset P_3\cap S'$, otherwise we see that $P_2\cap S'$ is not the maximal ideal in S' and so

$$A_{\tau_{23}}\geq 2+\lceil\frac{\operatorname{height}(P_2\cap S')}{2}\rceil\geq 3.$$

□

Theorem 4.2. *Let $I=\cap_{i=1}^4 P_i$ be a reduced intersection of four monomial prime ideals of S. Then Stanley's Conjecture holds for I.*

Proof. By [4, Lemma 3.6] it is enough to consider the case when $\sum_{j=1}^4 P_j=m$. If $t(I)\leq 2$ then the result follows by Corollary 1.7 and Proposition 4.1. Otherwise, there exists $i\in[s]$ such that $P_i\not\subset\sum_{1=j\neq i}^4 P_j$, let us say $P_4\not\subset\sum_{1=1}^3 P_j$. Apply induction on n, the case $n\leq 5$ being done in [9]. We assume that $\sum_{1=1}^3 P_j=(x_1,\ldots,x_r)$ for some $r<n$. Apply Theorem 1.6 as before with $\mathcal{F}$ containing just $\tau=\{4\}$. We have

$$A_\tau\geq\operatorname{sdepth}_{S_\tau}((\cap_{j=1}^3 P_j)\cap S_\tau)+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S'}(P_4\cap S')\geq\operatorname{depth}_{S_\tau}((\cap_{j=1}^3 P_j)\cap S_\tau)+1$$

by [8] and so

$$A_\tau\geq\operatorname{depth}_{S_\tau} S_\tau/((\cap_{j=1}^3 P_j)\cap S_\tau)+2=2+\operatorname{depth}_S S/((\cap_{j=1}^3(P_j+P_4))=$$

$$1+\operatorname{depth}_S((\cap_{j=1}^3(P_j+P_4))\geq\operatorname{depth}_S I$$

by Lemma 2.1. Suppose $I\cap S''\neq 0$. Then $A_0\geq n-r+\operatorname{sdepth}_{S''}(I\cap S'')$ by [4, Lemma 3.6]. If $t(I\cap S'')\leq 2$ we get $\operatorname{sdepth}_{S''}(I\cap S'')\geq\operatorname{depth}_{S''}(I\cap S'')$ as above. Otherwise there exists $i\in[4]$ such that $(P_i\cap S'')\not\subset\sum_{1=j\neq i}^4(P_j\cap S')$ and we get a similar estimate using the induction hypothesis (less variables). Thus $A_0\geq n-r+\operatorname{depth}_{S''}(I\cap S'')\geq\operatorname{depth}_S I$ by [11, Proposition 1.2]. □

Example 4.3. Let $n=10$, $P_1=(x_1,\ldots,x_7)$, $P_2=(x_3,\ldots,x_8)$,
$P_3=(x_1,\ldots,x_4,x_8,\ldots,x_{10})$, $P_4=(x_1,x_2,x_5,x_8,x_9,x_{10})$, $P_5=(x_5,\ldots,x_{10})$. We have $P_1+P_3=P_2+P_3=P_1+P_4=P_2+P_4=P_3+P_5=P_1+P_5=m$, $P_2+P_5=m\setminus\{x_1,x_2\}$, $P_3+P_4=m\setminus\{x_6,x_7\}$, $P_4+P_5=m\setminus\{x_3,x_4\}$, $P_1+P_2=m\setminus\{x_9,x_{10}\}$. We have $t(I)=2$. Applying the proof of Lemma 3.4 (see there the last exact sequence), we get

$$\operatorname{depth}_S S/I=\min\{\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2),\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_2\cap\ldots\cap P_5)\}.$$

We have $\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_1\cap P_2)=3$ and for $a:=\operatorname{depth}_S S/(P_2\cap\ldots\cap P_5)$ we apply (3) of Lemma 3.2, with $P_4+P_5\neq m$ and $P_2+P_3=m$. As for $j=2$ we have $P_2+P_4=m\neq P_2+P_5$ and for $j=3$ we have $P_3+P_4\neq m=P_3+P_5$ it follows that $a=1+\dim S/(P_4+P_5)=3$ and so $\operatorname{depth}_S I=4$.

Applying Theorem 1.6 to P_1 as main prime we see that $A_{3,4}^{(1)}\geq 3$, where $A_{3,4}^{(1)}$ denotes A_τ when P_1 is the main prime for $\tau=\{3,4\}$. Indeed,

$$A_{3,4}^{(1)}\geq\operatorname{sdepth}_{K[x_6,x_7]}(x_6,x_7)K[x_6,x_7]+\operatorname{sdepth}_{K[x_8,x_9,x_{10}]}(x_8,x_9,x_{10})K[x_8,x_9,x_{10}]=3.$$

Similarly choosing P_2 as a main prime we get $A^{(2)}_{3,4} \geq 3$ (now the usual r-variables are the variables generating P_2, namely $x_3, \dots, x_8$) and taking P_3,P_4 as main primes we get $A^{(3)}_{2,5} \geq 3$, respectively $A^{(4)}_{2,5} \geq 3$. Thus from these we cannot conclude that $\operatorname{sdepth}_S I \geq \operatorname{depth}_S I$. Fortunately, choosing P_5 as a main prime you can see that all $A_\tau \geq 4$, which is enough (notice that $\{2\} \notin \mathcal{F}^{(5)}$). Note that $\dim S/P_5 = 4$ is maximum possible among $\dim S/P_i$, but we have also $\dim S/P_2 = \dim S/P_4 = 4$.

Remark 4.4. The above example shows that it is not clear how one can use the special Stanley decompositions from [8, Proposition 2.3] (see here Theorem 1.6) in general. It is not clear that we may find always a "good" main prime P_i. If it really exists then it is not clear how we could pick it, the maximum dimension of S/P_i seems to be not enough. On the other hand, if we apply Theorem 1.6 for $r = 8$, that is to the case $P_1 + P_2 = (x_1, \dots, x_8)$, then

$$A^{(12)}_5 \geq \operatorname{sdepth}((x_3, x_4) \cap (x_1, x_2) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_4]) + \operatorname{sdepth}((x_9, x_{10}) \cap K[x_9, x_{10}]) = 4,$$

$$\operatorname{depth}((x_3, x_4) \cap (x_1, x_2) \cap K[x_1, \dots, x_4]) + \operatorname{depth}((x_9, x_{10}) \cap K[x_9, , x_{10}]) = 3 < \operatorname{depth}_S I.$$

Thus, we cannot hope to prove the Stanley's Conjecture, in general, by induction on n, using these special Stanley decompositions.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Biro, D. Howard, M. Keller, W. Trotter, S. Young, *Interval partition and Stanley depth*, J. Combin. Theory, 117, (2010), 475-482.

[2] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Revised edition. Cambridge University Press (1998).

[3] G. Fløystad, J.Herzog, *Gröbner basis of syzygies and Stanley depth,* to appear in J. Algebra, arXiv:AC/1003.4495v1.

[4] J. Herzog, M. Vladoiu, X. Zheng, *How to compute the Stanley depth of a monomial ideal,* J. Algebra, 322 (2009), 3151-3169.

[5] M. Ishaq, *Upper bounds for the Stanley depth*, to appear in Comm. Algebra, arXiv:AC/1003.3471.

[6] M. Ishaq, *Values and bounds of the Stanley depth*, to appear in Carpathian J. Math., arXiv:AC/1010.4692.

[7] G. Lyubeznik, On the arithmetic rank of monomial ideals. J. Algebra 112, 8689 (1988).

[8] A. Popescu, *Special Stanley Decompositions*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sc. Math. Roumanie, 53(101), no 4 (2010), arXiv:AC/1008.3680.

[9] D. Popescu, *An inequality between depth and Stanley depth*, Bull. Math. Soc. Sc. Math. Roumanie 52(100), (2009), 377-382, arXiv:AC/0905.4597v2.

[10] D. Popescu, I. Qureshi, *Computing the Stanley depth*, J. Algebra, 323 (2010), 2943-2959.

[11] A. Rauf, *Depth and Stanley depth of multigraded modules*, Comm. Algebra, 38 (2010),773-784.

[12] R.P. Stanley, *Linear Diophantine equations and local cohomology,* Invent. Math. 68 (1982) 175-193.

[13] R. H. Villarreal, *Monomial Algebras*, Marcel Dekker Inc., New York, 2001.

DORIN POPESCU, SIMION STOILOW INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, RESEARCH UNIT 5, UNIVERSITY OF BUCHAREST, P.O.BOX 1-764, BUCHAREST 014700, ROMANIA

E-mail address: `dorin.popescu@imar.ro`